

THE RELATION OF ATTACHMENT, ADJUSTMENT AND NARCISSISM
TO MASCULINE GENDER ROLE CONFLICT

Brian W. Selby, B.S., M.S.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August, 1999

APPROVED:

C. Edward Watkins, Major Professor
Tim Lane, Committee Member
Martin Gieda, Committee Member
Judy McConnell, Committee Member
Ernest Harrell, Chair of the
Department of Psychology
C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B.
Toulouse School of Graduate
Studies

Selby, Brian W., The relation of attachment, adjustment and narcissism to masculine gender role conflict. Doctor of Philosophy (Psychology), August, 1999, 105 pp., 8 tables, references, 57 titles.

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between masculine gender role conflict, attachment variables, narcissism, and adjustment. It was expected that men who reported higher masculine gender role conflict would also report unhealthy attachment, have a greater degree of narcissism and poorer adjustment. This study employed a sample of undergraduate males who completed self-report questionnaires measuring masculine gender role conflict, narcissism, adjustment, and attachment. Hypotheses were tested using canonical correlation techniques. Results indicated that healthy attachment was related to low masculine gender role conflict; however, unhealthy attachment was not related to high masculine gender role conflict. In terms of narcissism, higher amounts of narcissism were related to high amounts of gender role conflict, but in a subset of results individuals who reported low masculine gender role conflict also reported higher narcissism in areas that are assumed to relate to positive self regard. Results related to adjustment

indicated that high masculine gender role conflict was related to less psychological well-being replicating past studies. Theoretical and methodological issues were discussed in light of these findings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Masculine Gender Role Conflict-Theory	
Masculine Gender Role Conflict-Empirical Studies	
Attachment-Theory	
Attachment-Empirical Studies	
Narcissism-Theory	
Narcissism-Empirical Studies	
Rationale	
Hypotheses	
2. METHOD	37
Subjects and Procedure	
Instruments	
Analyses	
3. RESULTS	44
Description of the Sample	
Principle Analyses	
4. DISCUSSION	51
Attachment Variables	
Narcissism Variables	
Adjustment Variables	
Limitations	
Implications and Future Research	
APPENDIXES	68
REFERENCES	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographics	69
2. Means, standard deviations, and range of scores Masculine gender Role Conflict scale, Adult Attachment scale, Narcissistic Personality Inventory, and Hopkins Symptom Checklist scale	70
3. Correlations between Masculine Gender Role Conflict variables and Adult Attachment Scale variables	71
4. Correlations between Masculine Gender Role Conflict variables and Narcissistic Personality Inventory variables	72
5. Correlations between Masculine Gender Role Conflict variables and Hopkins Symptom Checklist variables	74
6. Correlations, standardized canonical coefficients, canonical correlations for masculine role conflict variables and attachment variables and their corresponding canonical variates	75
7. Correlations, standardized canonical coefficients, canonical correlations for masculine role conflict variables and narcissism variables and their corresponding canonical variates	76
8. Correlations, standardized canonical coefficients, canonical correlations for masculine role conflict variables and psychological well being variables and their corresponding canonical variates	78

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to explore masculine gender role conflict's relationship to interpersonal factors and adjustment. The strain and conflict related to attempting to be a traditionally masculine male, and the inherent detrimental aspects of the traditional masculine gender role, both psychologically, interpersonally, and physically has alternatively been called sex role strain (Pleck, 1981), gender role conflict (O'Neil, 1982), and gender role stress (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). For purposes of clarity, the term masculine gender role conflict will be used for this paper. Studies into masculine gender role conflict have become more common, and the issues explored have become more varied. Studies have shown the negative effects of conflicts related to traditional masculinity. Recent studies have shown lowered well being and adjustment, difficulties in interpersonal relationships, and increased alcohol consumption (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Fischer & Good, 1997).

Research into masculine gender role conflict has focused on distal results, such as adjustment difficulties. Few research studies have attempted to identify mediating factors in masculine gender role conflict and adjustment

(Heppner, 1995). It is logical to assume that although the direct result of masculine gender role conflict may be difficulties in adjusting, there are probably other factors which may result from the masculine gender role and create a lack of adjustment. Variables which may be affected by masculine role conflict and subsequently may influence interpersonal relationships are beginning to be assessed (Fischer & Good, 1997). A large body of research implicates interpersonal relationships which provide social support, if they are satisfactory, as having stress buffering effects and reducing various difficulties in adjustment and physical health (Barrera, 1981; Cobb, 1976). Thus, via social support, interpersonal factors affected by a man's gender role may relate to eventual adjustment.

A logical question becomes, "What factors may be related to gender roles and affect an individual's interpersonal relationships?" One factor that has shown a robust influence within interpersonal relationships is attachment style (Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Simpson, 1990). Attachment style is thought to be a current interpersonal orientation which is a result of past experiences within the parent-child relationship (Bowlby, 1988). Attachment has also been found to covary with gender in predictable ways, although gender role has not been assessed (Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994). Another factor that

has shown an influence in interpersonal relationships is narcissism (Carroll, Corning, Morgan, & Stevens, 1991). In short, narcissism is a trait in which individuals may be grandiose, hostile, exploitive, and lack empathy for others. Studies suggest that individuals exhibiting narcissistic traits may be rejected or avoided more frequently interpersonally. Initial evidence also suggests that narcissism may be related to traditional masculine gender roles (Carroll, 1989).

In summary, interpersonal attitudes may be related to masculine gender roles and conflict and result in difficulties in adjustment. One's current attachment style may be related to gender and lead one to view interpersonal relationships in a certain manner. In addition, narcissistic traits may influence one's interpersonal relationships negatively, and seem to be related to a traditional masculine gender role. In tandem these two constellations of interpersonal attitudes may be related to the social support one experiences, and subsequently to one's well being and psychological adjustment.

Masculine Gender Role Conflict - Theory

Gender role concepts have gone through great changes in the past three decades in part due to large societal changes. One large change that has influenced male gender roles is the women's movement of the 1970's. As women began

to assess their socialization and social role, and changed their roles based on this assessment, men (albeit more recently) have also begun to assess their satisfaction with traditional socialization influences both in popular literature, and in empirical research (Bly, 1990; O'Neil, 1980). This questioning of traditional gender role socialization has led researchers away from viewing gender as a biologically predisposed state, and instead viewing gender as being influenced by a combination of biological and learned factors. Although there are positive aspects to both the masculine and feminine traditional gender role, the negative aspects of the former is the focus of this paper.

Three major ways of conceptualizing masculine stress and conflict have been theorized and have influenced scholarship in this area. In general, theory within the area has attempted to define conflicts and stress that men may experience as they attempt to deal with societal expectations of a traditional gender role. It is assumed by all theories that a traditional masculine gender role is constraining, and does not allow for a full range of human emotion, behavior, and cognition.

Pleck (1981) initially described a theory of male sex role identity which directly challenged biologically based theories of gender role development. He titled the traditional biological way of thinking about gender roles

the "male sex role identity paradigm"(Pleck, 1981). From this traditional perspective the individual is programmed to develop in a certain manner biologically, and the problems surrounding gender roles are due to people not fitting them, not due to the roles themselves. In contrast, his new paradigm which he describes as, "sex role strain" describes gender roles as potentially constricting and due to societal norms rather than biological dictates" (Pleck, 1981). Ten major propositions make up this new paradigm.

The first proposition is that, "[s]ex roles are operationally defined by sex role stereotypes and norms" (Pleck, 1981, p.135). In this proposition sex roles are due to widely shared beliefs about the way a gender should behave. The second proposition is that "[s]ex roles are contradictory and inconsistent" (Pleck, 1981, p.142). This proposition suggests paradoxical messages, for example, although men are rewarded for being unfeminine and engaging in non-emotional, intellectual pursuits, they are also expected to be able to engage in intimate, emotional relationships with women. The third proposition is that, "[t]he proportion of individuals who violate sex roles is high" (Pleck, 1981, p.143). This proposition suggests that sex roles create strain because it is impossible for many individuals, due to normative personality differences, to fit within all mandates of traditional sex roles. The

fourth proposition is that, "[v]iolating sex roles leads to social condemnation" (Pleck, 1981). This proposition describes social sanctions which may occur when an individual deviates from what is considered "normal" (traditional) masculine behaviors. The fifth proposition is that, "[v]iolating sex roles leads to negative psychological consequences" (Pleck, 1981, p.145). This proposition suggests that an individual may devalue themselves when they do not meet societal expectations within sex roles. The sixth proposition is that, "[a]ctual or imagined violation of sex roles leads individuals to overconform to them" (Pleck, 1981, p.145). This proposition suggests that individuals who do not fit gender role stereotypes may exaggerate masculine behavior in compensation. The seventh proposition is that, "[v]iolating sex roles has more severe consequences for males than for females" (Pleck, 1981, p.147). This proposition suggests that negative social sanctions are particularly high for men, and that women have greater latitude in what is considered appropriate. The eighth proposition is that, "[c]ertain characteristics prescribed by sex roles are psychologically dysfunctional" (Pleck, 1981, p.147). This proposition suggests that certain prescribed characteristics of the masculine gender role are inadequate, for example, men are expected to be unemotional, and not to need help, and thus may not get

support for difficult emotional states. The ninth proposition is that, "[e]ach sex experiences sex role strain in its paid work and family roles" (Pleck, 1981, p.151). This proposition suggests that many men feel inadequate as breadwinners and fathers, due to the conflicts in time that both roles create. The tenth, and final, proposition states that, "[h]istorical change causes sex role strain" (Pleck, 1981, p.152). This proposition suggests that, as society changes over time, new stresses are put on gender roles and resources needed to fulfill them. Pleck's emphasis on the societal nature of gender roles, the difficulties inherent in fitting within them, and their arbitrary and contradictory nature helped to lead the masculine gender role research area away from the traditional, biological gender identity viewpoint.

The second major theory of masculine role conflict was O'Neil's (1982) "gender role conflict" theory. O'Neil (1980) defined gender role conflict as, "a psychological state where sex roles have negative consequences or impact on the person or on another. These consequences occur when there is a discrepancy or conflict that is culturally associated with gender." Thus, O'Neil describes a conflict in which discrepancies exist between personal characteristics and sex-role norms. Central to conflict within this discrepancy is the "fear of femininity" (O'Neil,

1982). This occurs when men fear their feminine side, and believe exhibiting this side will end in "disrespect, failure, and emasculation" (O'Neil, 1982). According to O'Neil this is similar to Jung's explanation of the anima and animus, in which a male's unconscious internal fight against his feminine side (anima) will create a projection of his femininity outward, for example, onto female romantic figures. From this intrapsychic model, integrating masculinity and femininity becomes key.

O'Neil theorized that masculine gender role conflict occurs in six patterns. The first pattern is "restrictive emotionality" (O'Neil, 1982). Within this pattern a male finds it difficult to express emotions, and denies others the ability to express emotion. Emotion is seen as vulnerability, and as being out of control. Difficulties with recognizing emotions may create difficulties in interpersonal situations, in which the individual cannot grasp the complexities of emotional situations. The second pattern is "homophobia" (O'Neil, 1982). This pattern is a belief in negative stereotypes about homosexual individuals, and a fear that one will appear to be homosexual. This fear may result in a suppression of feminine traits. The third pattern is "socialized control, power, and competition issues" (O'Neil, 1982). This is a pattern in which the fear of femininity causes the individual to focus on competition,

power, and control. Men may attempt to validate their masculinity through their ability to compete and gain power and control. The fourth pattern is "restrictive sexual and affectionate behavior" (O'Neil, 1982). This pattern relates to difficulties experiencing the emotional, sensual, intimate aspects of sexuality. The fifth pattern is "obsession with achievement and success" (O'Neil, 1982). This pattern consists of a man's obsession with work and accomplishments, at the expense of other roles such as husband, father, friend, and family man. The sixth, and final pattern, is "health care problems" (O'Neil, 1982). Within this pattern an individual has difficulties maintaining health behaviors such as diet, exercise, relaxation, and adequate medical care. O'Neil's theoretical ideas have allowed masculine gender role research to target conflict within specific areas of men's life. This has increased the ability to empirically assess masculine gender role conflict as a theoretical construct.

The third major theory of masculine gender role conflict was developed by Eisler and Skidmore (1987). They termed their concept "masculine gender role stress" and linked it more than the previous theorists to the stress and coping literature. Their concept refers to "cognitive appraisal of specific situations" that are stressful for men (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). These stressful situations were

found to be unrelated to masculine gender roles. Masculine gender roles are only related in that an individual with a masculine role would find these situations more stressful than women with a feminine style. Eisler and Skidmore empirically derived five different categories of stressful situations for men. These categories are physical inadequacy, emotional inexpressiveness, subordination to women, intellectual inferiority, and performance failures in work or sex. Eisler and Skidmore's contribution to the area is their alternative conception of stressful situations experienced by men. This conceptualization may lead to research on the physical consequences, and other ramification of gender role stress on men. Many of the gender role stress situations theorized by Eisler occur in an interpersonal context, as does much of the conflict within the theories of Pleck and O'Neil, although addressed in theoretical literature this interpersonal piece is only beginning to be addressed empirically (Cook, 1990; Fischer & Good, 1997; Lewis, 1978; O'Neil, 1982; Pleck, 1981).

Most of the theoretical literature which addresses interpersonal issues related to masculine role conflict discusses the negative ramifications of a traditional masculine role (Cook, 1990; Fischer & Good, 1997; Good & Borst, 1994; Lewis, 1978). Some of the theorized interpersonal ramifications of a traditional masculine role

are restrictive emotion, fear of intimacy, less self disclosure, less empathy, low self insight, less cooperative, less egalitarian, more dominant, and having less relationship satisfaction and social support. From a theoretical standpoint the effects of a masculine gender role on interpersonal relationships can be seen to be very damaging, and it is logical to assume this may have an effect on men's ability to gain social support and their psychological adjustment.

In summary, three major theoretical contributions have influenced scholarship in the area of masculine gender role conflict. These models have addressed the ambiguities, difficulties, contradictions, and stress of attempting to fulfill a traditional masculine role within our society. They have also led the field away from viewing gender as biological predestination, and toward an environmental learning and societal norm view of gender. In addition, specific areas have been specified where men are most likely to experience conflicts as they attempt to fulfill masculine gender role societal expectations. Cumulatively these theoretical issues link with difficulties in adjustment in the psychological, interpersonal, and physical realm.

Masculine Gender Role Conflict - Empirical Studies

The empirical studies of masculine gender role conflict have begun to address the multitude of negative effects of

conflict and stress theorized to be created by attempting to fulfill a masculine gender role. This area of research is relatively new, and there does not exist a large body of research exploring the multiple relationships theorized to exist between masculine gender roles and interpersonal, psychological and physical functioning. Areas that have been addressed sparsely cluster in the interpersonal relationship (i.e., vocational, family, and attitudes) and physical realm. The majority of the research has focused on distal adjustment related variables (some of which are interpersonally related), although interpersonal issues are beginning to be addressed in terms of their potential effect on adjustment variables (Fischer & Good, 1997; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). In addition, parent-child relationships and attachment are just beginning to be assessed, although one study in this area focused on current relationships with parents rather than trait-related forms of attachment (Fischer & Good, 1998). The area which will be reviewed related to masculine role conflict is adjustment, which includes variables such as depression, anxiety, self esteem, anger, intimacy and chemical substance usage.

Masculine Gender Role Conflict and Adjustment

Adjustment studies initially looked at depression as evidence of difficulties with adjusting to masculine gender role conflict. The first such study was conducted by Good

and Mintz (1990). This study found that all areas of gender role conflict theorized by O'Neil (1982), and tested using O'Neil's Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS-I), were related to depression in undergraduate students (Good & Mintz, 1990; O'Neil et al., 1986). These areas are Success, Power, and Competition; Restrictive Emotionality; Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; and Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations. In general, the authors speculated that these relationships are due to a reluctance to communicate emotions, and interference of drives for success with other important areas of life.

Another area of adjustment that was assessed by an early study was physical strain, interpersonal strain, and vocational strain in men of different ages, races, and social classes (Stillson et al., 1991). Results indicated that complaints about physical illness and poor self care habits are related to masculine gender role strain. Sharpe and Heppner (1991) addressed several aspects of adjustment including some variables related to interpersonal factors. The variables they studied included anxiety, depression, self esteem and intimacy with others and their potential relationship to masculine gender role conflict. Results with undergraduate students indicated that masculine gender role conflict was related to higher anxiety, depression and lower self esteem and intimacy with others.

Good and Wood (1995) performed a study which assessed male gender role conflict and its potential relationship to adjustment. They found that achievement related male gender role conflict was related to depression in undergraduate males. The authors speculated that depression may be a result of attempting to balance conflicting work and personal obligations, and competing with other men. Lack of achievement may result in low self esteem and depression.

Good et al. (1995) performed a study which assessed psychological distress and fear of intimacy in relationship to masculine gender role conflict in undergraduate males. Within fear of intimacy the Restrictive Emotionality Scale had the largest positive relationship, with Restrictive Affective Behavior Between Men having a modest, but significant relationship. Psychological distress had a positive correlation with all scales of the Gender Role Conflict Scale with Restrictive Emotionality having the largest positive relationship, and Conflicts Between Work and Family Relationships having a slightly smaller relationship. The authors suggested that, regarding fear of intimacy, men with traditional masculine gender roles have difficulties and anxiety about close dating relationships.

Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995) performed a study of masculine gender role conflict as it relates to psychological well-being and age group. The authors

employed two samples, one was college aged and the other averaged 40 years of age. Results indicated that gender role conflict, especially Restrictive Emotionality, was moderately related to lack of well-being in a negative direction, regardless of age. In addition, conflicts within the scales differed based on age. Younger men experienced more conflicts surrounding competition, and older men experienced more conflicts surrounding work and family conflicts.

Good et al. (1996) explored masculine gender role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. Results suggested that masculine gender role conflict was positively associated, with moderate strength, to psychological distress including depression, interpersonal sensitivity, and other factors not yet addressed in non-clinical samples, such as obsessive-compulsiveness, paranoid ideation, and psychoticism. The authors speculated that a great deal of psychological symptoms are a result of attempting to limit emotionality by men.

Blazina and Watkins (1996) examined masculine gender role conflict and well being. Results indicated that the Success, Power, and Competition variable of the Gender Role Conflict scale was related to lack of well-being, including anger and alcohol usage. The Restrictive Emotionality

factor was found to be related to lack of well being, anxiety, anger and increased similarity in personality style to substance abusers.

Fischer and Good (1997) took a different approach in addressing masculine gender role conflict, choosing to focus their study on emotional issues and intimacy related to masculine gender role conflict, speculating that this would affect interpersonal relationships. Results indicated that Restrictive Emotionality emerged as a predictor of fear of intimacy. The authors speculate that men who restrict their emotions may be at a greater risk for lacking social support systems which facilitate effective coping.

In summary, the literature on adjustment and masculine gender role conflict paints a dark picture of the results of traditional masculinity and adjustment. A broad spectrum of variables related to negative adjustment are also related to traditional masculine gender roles. These variables range from psychological symptoms such as depression and anxiety, to fears of intimacy within interpersonal relationships, chemical substance use, anger and physical strain. This paper will focus on the area of interpersonal relationships, which seems to be highly related to the effects of masculine gender role conflict (Fischer & Good, 1997; Good et al., 1995; Good et al. 1996; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). To address this area two bodies of research will be reviewed, both of

which are hypothesized to be related to masculine gender roles: attachment literature, which looks at current interpersonal attitudes towards others, and narcissism, which is a style of relating to others characterized by grandiosity and lack of empathy.

Attachment - Theory

Attachment theory does not specifically address gender within its constructs. Different types of attachment are thought to be evenly distributed across gender, but it is possible that attachment styles may be related to different gender role variables (Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994). In general, attachment is a current interpersonal style, which has been theorized to consist of attitudes and cognitions regarding others (Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). It seems reasonable that one's interpersonal style may be related to one's gender role due to the differences in attitudes about relationships between different traditional gender roles (Mahalik, 1999). This paper will first review theory related to attachment style, then compare masculine gender role conflict theory with different aspects of attachment theory.

The quality of the attachment within an individual's original parent-child relationship, particularly in infancy, seems to leave individuals with three different ways of viewing other important attachment relationships.

Generally, attachment literature has supported three different individual interpersonal styles, which are termed attachment styles (Ainsworth, 1979). These styles have been theorized to be stable, trait-like, and enduring interpersonal styles which continue into adulthood (Collins & Read, 1990; Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). An anxious/ambivalent style is characterized by a need for merger with the attachment figure and angry protest at the loss of affiliative contact. An individual exhibiting a secure style is capable of trust in the attachment figure and independent functioning, including exploration of the environment. An individual exhibiting an avoidant style seems to distrust close relationships and has a need for being independent of close relationships. This last style seems to be most similar, theoretically, to a traditionally masculine gender role.

Theory within the masculine gender role conflict area discusses difficulties with closeness and intimacy that seem to co-exist with traditional masculinity. Masculinity theory also discusses independence, and not needing to depend on others, which are also characteristics of an avoidant style of attachment (Collins & Read, 1990; Lewis, 1978). In addition, avoidant individuals have been described as uneasy with intimacy and attempt to maintain emotional distance (Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994). These

similarities suggest that attachment style and gender roles are theoretically related.

In summary, three attachment styles (secure, anxious and avoidant) are theorized to be enduring interpersonal styles that relate to how individuals view others. Theoretically, the avoidant style shares conceptual similarities with traditional masculine gender roles. Combining these two large bodies of theoretical ideas brings a well established stylistic theoretical perspective of men's views about relationships together with their views of what is appropriate for their gender. Despite the theoretical similarities, little research has been done to address them.

Attachment - Empirical Studies

Most of the relevant attachment literature which has addressed gender differences exists in social psychological research. Very little research has been done specifically relating gender to attachment, although Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) have suggested research which relates gender roles to attachment and Fischer and Good (1998) have begun to address attachment and masculine gender role conflict. Several studies have been done within social psychology which address attachment and different variables related to romantic relationships. Throughout these studies, gender differences in attachment and related variables are

discussed, although this was not the express purpose of the research studies. Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) produced a seminal article which addressed gender and attachment style, and this article will be the basis of this review. Fischer and Good (1998), as the only research study to date, that has specifically looked at attachment related constructs and masculine gender role conflict and will be presented last.

Several research findings in the attachment arena seem to parallel masculine gender role conflict literature. Specifically, the avoidant style of attachment seems very similar within the literature to traditional masculine gender roles. Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) found that avoidant men reported being significantly less committed, satisfied, intimate and caring than secure men, and significantly less committed and passionate than anxious men. Simpson (1990) found that avoidant men were less distressed emotionally following relationship dissolution. In addition, a reliable negative relationship was found between avoidant style in men and emotionality. Research findings also suggest that men were more likely to be categorized as "dismissive" avoidants which their research instrument described as "downplaying the importance of close relationships, restricted emotionality, an emphasis on independence and self-reliance, and a lack of clarity or credibility in discussing relationships" (Bartholomew and

Horowitz, 1991, p.229). These findings indicate an avoidance of emotion, that is very similar conceptually to O'Neil's (1982) concept of Restrictive emotionality. In terms of the influence on relationships of an avoidant style, Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) stated, "[a]voidant men's devaluing of relationships may simply reflect adherence to traditional stereotypes" (cited in Collins & Read, 1990, p.661). These empirical findings establish a clear conceptual link between avoidant attachment style and traditional masculine gender roles.

A crucial aspect of attachment literature is that it has established empirical links between attachment style and relationship satisfaction. Attachment literature findings suggest that individuals with secure styles report greater satisfaction, intimacy, and commitment in their relationships, whereas avoidant individuals report significantly less of these variables (Feeney & Noller, 1990; Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994; Simpson, 1990). These links make attachment literature capable of predicting one's evaluation of different relationships, as well as, in the case of a romantic relationship, one's partner's evaluation of the relationship (provided both individuals attachment styles are known). For example, Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) found in their sample (354 romantic couples) that no anxious-anxious or avoidant-avoidant pairs were found. It

is suggested by the authors that these different styles do not meet the other style's expectations of relationships. Linking attachment literature with the masculine gender role conflict literature may allow the area to move towards assessing, to a greater extent, how masculine gender roles influence relationships.

Fischer and Good (1998) performed a study which begins to link attachment relationships to masculine gender role conflict. The author's looked at the role of attachment (closeness and support), conflict, and facilitation of independence for each parent (mother and father) to masculine gender role conflict and stress. This study did not look at attachment as discrete types (e.g., secure, anxious, avoidant), but more as degree of closeness and support. The results indicated that less conflicts with parents related to less masculine role stress within having a subordinate role with women, and less concern about intellectual and physical adequacy. In addition, sons who reported positive relationships with parents also reported fewer masculine role conflicts around restrictive emotionality, although they reported more conflicts around success, power and competition. The authors hypothesized that the conflicts about success, power and competition may be related around normal concerns of first year college students. For example, trying to prove oneself in a

different and challenging environment. Finally, the authors reported that sons who reported positive relationships to their father also reported less emotional restriction and inexpressiveness and less concern about performance and intellectual inferiority.

In summary, attachment research has shown a close conceptual link with masculine gender role conflict, specifically within the avoidant attachment style. Research has shown that men are more likely than women to be "dismissive" avoidant, and men may show less emotionality following relationship dissolution. Attachment literature has established relationship satisfaction links to attachment styles, with avoidant styles experiencing less intimacy, commitment, and satisfaction. The only research study to date related to attachment indicated that positive relationships to parents are related to less masculine role conflict. Specifically, more positive relationships with parents are related to less emotional restrictiveness and inexpressiveness especially within a son's relationship to his father. In addition, positive attachment to one's father is related to less concern about performance and intellectual inferiority. The conceptual and empirical links between masculine gender roles and attachment research may allow the area to move further by explicating different relationship variables that are crucial to an understanding

of the ramifications of masculine gender role conflict. Another relationship influencing variable that seems to have implications for relationship satisfaction is the interpersonal style of narcissism.

Narcissism - Theory

Narcissism has a rich history dating to early civilizations, such as in the mythical figure of Narcissus in Greek mythology. Freud was the first contemporary writer to write about narcissism, thus allowing the concept to gain a foothold in the psychological literature. Freud originally theorized about narcissism in his essay "On Narcissism: An Introduction" (Freud 1914/1989). In this work he proposes the existence of two types of libido, ego-libido (self libido) and object-libido (other libido). In narcissism libido is withdrawn from others, and directed towards oneself. According to Freud the more libido is withdrawn into the self the less available it is for interpersonal relationships, and the more it is directed at others the less available it is to the self. He suggests that this is a normal aspect of children's development, however, Freud theorized that as individuals mature into choosing love-objects the extent to which they attempt to choose themselves as love objects becomes narcissism. Within normal adults Freud proposed that narcissism becomes invested in an "ideal ego". This perfect ideal draws a

large amount of libido in its maintenance, which may be sublimated (directed toward another aim remote from sex) or repressed (not brought to consciousness). Sublimation is suggested as the more healthy way of dealing with this excess libido, rather than repression which has negative consequences. Repression of libidinal instincts tends to occur if an individual is particularly idealistic and unreasonable. The final consequence of repressed libido is that very little libido is available for love-objects, and libido must be conserved to enrich the individual's ego. Thus, from Freud's perspective a narcissistic individual would have difficulties investing love within relationships and may tend to seek individuals for interpersonal relationships that are very similar to themselves.

Recent revisions in psychoanalytic thought were proposed by Kernberg (1975) and Kohut (1971). These two theorists differ somewhat within etiology theory and the role of narcissism in an individual's life. Kernberg proposed that the familial background of narcissists consisted of cold and rejecting parents. Concurrently the developing narcissist finds that they have a specialness within status or talents that helps buffer their parents rejecting attitudes. Kohut has a more developmental theory of etiology in which narcissistic dimensions exists in all individuals throughout life in some form. In a healthy

individual narcissism accounts for humor and creativity. In pathological narcissism early development consists of facing realistic shortcomings of caretakers, and the disappointment which follows, by failing to gain self-confidence due to a lack of empathic and warm care. These individuals then persistently seek narcissistic recognition through adulthood.

More recent approaches, including object relations approaches, as espoused by Masterson (1988, 1990), suggest that a narcissistic individual's personality is based on a defensive false self characterized by grandiosity that must be kept inflated in order not to feel the underlying rage and depression associated with an inadequate, fragmented sense of self. Masterson proposes that this personality constellation is caused by a mother who does not introduce a child to frustration experiences that allow the child to recognize that they are not infallible and grandiose. A grandiose false self remains, with an impaired, rageful real self that resulted from a mother who expected perfection. This etiological viewpoint is similar to Miller (1981) and Mahler (1972), who proposed that grandiosity in individuals results from unempathic parenting, and being "narcissistically cathected" by a mother who expects the child to behave and act in a particular way, and to fulfill her own needs for admiration, recognition and achievement.

Based on Masterson's theoretical ideas, in the interpersonal realm a narcissist uses others to mirror themselves, or to exploit toward their own ends. In addition, Masterson theorizes that a narcissistic individual will have little empathy for others, and avoid emotional involvement or commitment. Others are blamed for difficulties, since the narcissist can do no wrong. Thus, object relations theorists suggest that difficulties in interpersonal relationships for narcissistic individuals begin within early relationships to parents who expect the child to be something they're not. This causes the child to act in a grandiose manner to disguise their underlying rage and depression.

In addition, and in relationship, to these theoretical ideas, narcissism has developed as a clinical disorder, mostly within the psychiatric literature, and exists as constellation of symptoms, which is termed a personality disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). According to this manual Narcissistic Personality Disorder is a, "pervasive pattern of grandiosity, need for admiration, and lack of empathy that begins by early adulthood and is present in a variety of contexts." Individuals believe that they are extremely important and may overestimate their importance. They usually require admiration and may have a sense of entitlement. They also

lack empathy, and may be hostile or contemptuous of others. Finally, narcissistic individuals may be envious of others or believe that others are envious of them, and may be patronizing. It can be theorized from this description that these attitudes and behaviors would have a negative effect on interpersonal functioning.

In summary, theory suggests that narcissism is a complex intrapsychic and interpersonal constellation of affect, attitudes and behaviors which directly relate to an individual's interpersonal functioning. Much of the theoretical ideas in narcissism seem to parallel the theoretical discussion of masculinity. Interpersonal issues such as lack of empathy, dominance, hostility, and need for admiration parallel much of the theory within masculine gender role conflict. Empirical work with narcissism has helped to further explicate narcissism, and extend the theoretical literature.

Narcissism - Empirical Studies

Past empirical work with narcissism has revolved around developing scales and validating them, in order to quantify narcissism as a construct. Specifically, several studies have been done to validate the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988). This work has found many psychological correlates to narcissism. Personality variables that have been studied and have been found to be

associated with narcissism are hostility and aggression (Raskin & Terry, 1988), grandiosity and dominance (Raskin, Novaceck & Hogan, 1991), lack of empathy for others (Watson et al., 1984), and exploitativeness (Emmons, 1984).

Other correlates of a narcissistic style include gender (Carrol, 1989). The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual-IV (DSM-IV) indicates that gender prevalence for Narcissistic Personality Disorder is 50%-75% male (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Thus, it is possible that this interpersonal style may be particularly salient for men.

Current and past studies have focused on other aspects of narcissism, including gender correlates, functioning and interpersonal effects of a narcissistic style (Carrol et al., 1996). Despite a well validated instrument, relatively few studies have focused on the effects of a narcissistic style. One such early study was performed by Watson et al. (1987). This represents an early and flawed attempt to address narcissism and gender roles. The authors conclude that the NPI consists of adaptive narcissism due to their positive relationship to self esteem and negative relationship to depression (on one out of two measures). They then conclude that, although results indicated that the NPI was more correlated with masculinity than femininity, using the Bem Sex Role Inventory, that any maladaptive

aspects related to masculinity are balanced by adaptive mechanisms.

This study is flawed in two major aspects. The Bem Sex Role Inventory has been criticized on its inability to address specific issues within the male role due to its global nature, and may measure self efficacy or assertiveness instead of masculinity (Good et al., 1989; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Due to these measurement issues the author's conclusions are suspect. In addition, these conclusions are clearly not in line with theory which suggests that depression underlies grandiosity in the narcissistic individual and this grandiosity would have conceptual links to high self esteem. A later study confirms these theoretical propositions by finding evidence that individuals, in the absence of grandiosity, dominance and narcissism, report lower self esteem (Raskin et al., 1991). It is clear from these results that this theoretical proposition, attributable to object relationship theorists, has some evidence in current empirical literature.

Another study using the Bem Sex-role Inventory investigated gender role orientation among bodybuilders, athletes and psychology students (Carroll, 1989). This study found that men and the masculine group scored higher on the narcissism inventory as compared to all other groups, including androgynous, undifferentiated, and feminine

groups, although these results should be interpreted cautiously due to the scale used. The authors also found some evidence that the bodybuilding group had higher scores on narcissism measures.

Narcissism seems to have specific ramifications interpersonally. Carroll et al. (1991) concluded that individuals who are perceived as narcissistic are perceived more negatively and are likely to be avoided by others. Carroll et al. (1996) found similar results, indicating that participants expressed significantly less interest in interacting with an individual exhibiting extreme narcissism, than an individual exhibiting moderate or low amounts of narcissism.

Although the negative effects of a narcissistic style has been documented, empirical research suggests that some degree of narcissism is related to positive self-regard and esteem (Raskin et al., 1991; Raskin & Novacek, 1989; Raskin & Terry, 1988). The authors suggest that healthy narcissism is related to congruency in one's self perception, while pathological narcissism is related to defensive and grandiose self-perceptions. In addition, different dimensions of narcissism seem more related to pathology. For example, exploitativeness and entitlement seem more related to pathology, than do dimensions such as authority, self-sufficiency and vanity, which seem more related to

nondefensive self esteem (Raskin et al., 1991; Raskin & Novacek, 1989).

In summary, empirical research on a narcissistic style has found several negative interpersonal correlates. In addition, the narcissistic style seems to be more prevalent in males, suggesting that this style may be conceptually related to masculine gender role conflict. Research has also suggested that certain dimensions of a narcissistic style are related to self esteem rather than pathology. Previous studies performed have used questionable instrumentation, but in general, have found that traditional masculine gender roles are related to a narcissistic style of relating. Published studies do not exist which pair a current masculine gender role conflict instrument with a narcissistic style and possible interpersonal ramifications of that style.

Rationale

Masculine gender role conflict literature has found important links between conflict about attempting to conform to a masculine gender role and negative consequences interpersonally, psychologically, and physically. Most of the literature has centered around an assessment of adjustment difficulties related to gender roles without enumerating the specific causes of adjustment difficulties, besides the obvious strain and stress involved in attempting

to conform to masculine gender roles which are ambiguous, contradictory, and in which non-conformity leads to social sanctions. Adjustment difficulties may result from mediating factors that are caused by masculine gender role conflict. The possible mediating factors are many due to the multiple arenas theorized to be affected by masculine gender role conflict, including vocational, familial, interpersonal, physical, emotional and psychological.

Research on masculine gender role conflict seems to indicate that struggling with conforming to traditional masculine gender roles results in less adjustment and well-being, and difficulties related to fear of intimacy and recognizing emotions. Other effects are increased alcohol usage and physical strain. One possible mediating factor that seems to encompass many of the areas theorized to be affected by masculine gender role conflict, and may cause many of the adjustment problems mentioned, are factors which relate to a man's interpersonal life. Research indicates that social support may buffer individuals from stress thus leading to a greater degree of adjustment. To gain social support it is necessary to have an interpersonal style consisting of cognitions and attitudes which enable one to gain access to social support. Two interpersonal style variables that relate to an individual's ability to gain interpersonal support are attachment and narcissism.

Attachment research indicates that individuals have three main styles of interacting with others. An individual with an avoidant style, which seems to be related to a traditional masculine role, tends to not want to be close or intimate in relationships, does not depend on others, and is not emotional or anxious about relationships. Individuals with this style of interacting tend not to be satisfied with relationships, and have low levels of commitment.

Narcissism is another interpersonal style that seems to be related to traditional masculinity. This style of interacting is indicated by grandiosity, hostility, and a lack of empathy. Research indicates that this style may be related to rejection and avoidance of others in interpersonal relationships. Previous research has minimally addressed attachment as a interpersonal style variable and has not addressed narcissism in relationship to masculine gender role conflict, although each variable has shown conceptual and empirical links to gender roles.

The purpose of this study was to explore masculine gender role conflict's potential relationship with attachment, narcissism and adjustment. Attachment is composed of three major dimensions, feeling close to others, depending on others, and anxiety about relationships with others. Narcissism is an interpersonal style which is composed of seven dimensions: authority, entitlement,

exhibitionism, exploitativeness, self sufficiency, superiority, and vanity. Research has consistently implicated poor adjustment as a result of a traditional masculine gender role. This study attempted to replicate and extend these findings by linking adjustment to interpersonal factors. Combining attachment and masculine gender role conflict is important to the literature because it integrates a well known, and researched, interpersonal style factor with gender roles. In addition, it provides a link to satisfaction within relationships, and ultimately it may lead to an assessment of the links between masculine gender roles, social support and adjustment. This study attempted to add to the literature by linking attachment and narcissistic interpersonal styles to traditional masculine gender roles, and adjustment.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 Men who score higher on the GRCS, as opposed to those who score lower, will lack feelings of closeness to others, feel as if they cannot depend on others, and lack anxiety about relationships to others on the AAS.

Hypothesis 2 Men who score higher on the GRCS, as opposed to those who score lower, will have a greater degree of narcissism as measured by the NPI.

Hypothesis 3 Men who score higher on the GRCS, as

opposed to those who score lower, will have high scores on depression, anxiety, and anger as measured by the HSC.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

Participants in this study were students at the University of North Texas. Subjects included 150 undergraduate male subjects between the ages of 18 and 22. Data were collected during the Spring semester of 1998. Participation in the study was voluntary, and students were given extra credit for involvement. Students were asked to participate in a study examining gender roles and relationships. Approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board.

Instruments

Adult Attachment Scale (AAS; Collins & Read, 1990). This scale was designed to measure dimensions of Dependency, Closeness, and Anxiety which are theorized to underlie and indicate adult attachment styles. Dependency indicates the extent to which subjects trust others and expect them to be available when needed. Closeness measures the extent that subjects are comfortable with closeness and intimacy. Anxiety reflects the extent to which subjects are comfortable with closeness and intimacy. These items for

this scale are based on the attachment style descriptions in Hazan and Shaver's (1987) original categorical measure (Collins & Read, 1990). Collins and Read's (1990) scale is an effort to provide greater discrimination among individuals by measuring dimensions underlying styles. The subscales were defined by factor analysis. The scale has 18 items which measure dimensions of attachment styles. Each subscale has six items. The scale ranges from not at all characteristic (1) to very characteristic (5). Scores are obtained by summing responses to each of the items of each subscale. Scores can range from 6 to 30 for each subscale, with higher scores indicating greater degrees of the construct measured.

Estimates of internal consistency (coefficient alpha) for each dimension were .75 (Depend), .72 (Anxiety), and .69 (Close). The relationship between the scales was found to be moderate to weak. The relationship of Close and Depend was moderate ($r=.38$), and the relationship between Anxiety and Close ($r=-.08$) and Anxiety and Depend ($r=-.24$) was weak. Test-retest reliability for each scale was .68 (Close), .71 (Depend), and .52 (Anxiety). According to the authors the low stability of the Anxiety subscale may be due to its close conceptual ties to a current relationship.

Validity was indicated by the relationship of dimensions to attachment styles. Subjects with high scores

on Close and Depend coupled with low scores on Anxiety appeared to have a secure attachment style. High scores on Anxiety coupled with moderate scores on Close and Depend indicate an anxious attachment type. Subjects who have low scores on Close, Depend, and Anxiety show an avoidant style. Collins and Read employed an undergraduate sample (Collins & Read, 1990) of 406 individuals.

Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil et al., 1986). This scale is an attempt to measure masculine role conflict. Four dimensions exist, and each subject receives a score on the dimensions and an overall score. The dimensions are Success, Power, and Competition; Restricted Emotionality; and Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men; and Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations. Dimensions were determined using factor analysis.

The scale has 37 items concerning men's thoughts and feelings regarding gender role behaviors. The scale ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Scores are determined by summing the responses then dividing by 37. Scores can range from 1-6 with higher scores indicating greater masculine role conflict.

Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was estimated and ranges from .75 to .85. Test-retest reliabilities (four week) range from .72 to .86. Construct validity was supplied by Good et al. (1995) by a relationship with a

measure of men's attitudes about masculinity. In addition the authors report that the scale is not prone to socially desirable responses.

Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988). This scale attempts to explore individual differences in narcissism in non-clinical populations. Seven factors have been found and labeled Exploitativeness, Entitlement, Leadership, Authority, Superiority, and Self Sufficiency and Vanity.

The scale has 40 items in which a pair of possible attitudes are presented to the subject. One component of the pair is a narcissistic statement, and the other component is a normal statement. The narcissistic statements are summed, with each statement receiving one point (1-40). Higher scores are indicative of greater amounts of narcissism.

Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) studies indicate that the NPI's subscale coefficients range from .50 to .73 (Raskin & Terry, 1988). Validity data are supplied by an association with hostility and aggression (Raskin & Terry, 1988), grandiosity and dominance (Raskin, Novaceck & Hogan, 1991), lack of empathy for others (Watson et al., 1984), and exploitativeness (Emmons, 1984).

Hopkins Symptom Checklist (Derogatis, Lipman, Rickels, Uhlenhuth & Covi, 1974). This scale was chosen over the

SCL-90 for economical reasons and its ability to mirror previous studies (Simonsen, Blazina & Watkins, in press). This scale attempts to measure a variety of psychological symptoms through self report. Three scales will be employed: depression, anger and anxiety. The scale has 58 items, and ranges from one (not at all) to four (extremely), and is a report of how often certain symptoms have been experienced in the last two weeks, including the present day. Scores can range from 58 to 232, with lower scores indicating fewer psychological symptoms. Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was estimated to be .86 for Depression, .84 for anxiety, and .74 for anger. Statistics were based on comparisons between 367 neurotic depressives and 432 heterogenous outpatients.

Procedure

Students completed a packet of pencil-and-paper measures at designated classrooms throughout the spring. Each packet contained a letter of introduction with instructions, an Informed Consent form (see Appendix), and the instruments described below. To insure confidentiality and candid responding, subjects were asked not to include identifying information on the materials.

Design and Analysis

Variables in this study were the male gender role conflict variables (Success, Power, and Competition;

Restrictive Emotionality; Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; and Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations), attachment variables (Close, Depend, and Anxiety), narcissism variables (Authority, Entitlement, Exhibitionism, Exploitativeness, Self Sufficiency, Superiority, and Vanity), and psychological symptom variables (Depression, Anxiety, and Anger).

To address the research hypotheses a canonical correlation procedure was employed to assess the relation between masculine gender role conflict variables, attachment variables, and narcissism and psychological well-being variables. Canonical correlation is a multivariate technique which allows for the examination of the correlation between two sets of variables. This produces "roots" which are canonical variates composed of a linear combination of a set of variables. The maximum number of canonical roots produced is equal to the number of variables in the smallest variable set. The relative weighting of each variable is assessed by interpreting the standardized canonical coefficients.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Description of the Sample

Characteristics of participants sampled in this study are presented in Table 1. One hundred and fifty college-aged men between the ages of 18 and 22 participated in this study. Due to the exploratory nature of the current study, this sample was chosen to correspond to past studies using the Masculine Gender Role Conflict Scale.

The current sample consisted of fairly equal portions of 19, 20, 21 and 22 year old males (26%, 22%, 23% and 20% respectively). A smaller portion of the sample was 18 years old (8.7%). The majority of the participants were white (74.7%), with other ethnic groups representing 25.3% of the subject population (African American 12%, Hispanic 5.3%, Asian American 6.7%, and Other, 1.3%).

When subjects described their religious orientations, they tended to report Other (41.3%), with Protestant as the next largest group (24.7%). In terms of marital status, the majority of subjects reported never having been married or lived with their significant other (93.3%) and a minority reported being married or living together (6.7%), and none reported being married or widowed.

Descriptive Statistics for Measures

Variables used in this study included Masculine Gender Role Conflict subscales, Adult Attachment Scale subscales, Hopkins Symptom Checklist subscales and Narcissistic Personality Inventory Subscales. The means and standard deviations for all variables are presented in Table 2. Results for the Adult Attachment scale were similar to earlier studies using men (Collins & Read, 1990). Results for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory were also very similar to past studies with a slightly higher total narcissism mean score than previous studies (Raskin & Terry, 1988). Results for the Masculine Gender Role Conflict subscales are very similar to past research with the exception of slightly lower scores on the Success, Power and Competition subscale (Blazina, 1996). Hopkins Symptom Checklist results are very similar to past studies (Simonsen, Blazina & Watkins, in press).

Table 3 displays the correlations between masculine gender role conflict and attachment variables. Significant correlations were found for all variables of interest. Conflict Between Work and Family Relationships was negatively related to Depend on the attachment measure. Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men was negatively related to Close and Depend on the attachment measure. Restrictive Emotionality was negatively related to both

Depend and Close and was positively related to Anxiety on the attachment measure.

Table 4 displays the correlations between masculine gender role conflict and narcissism variables. Significant correlations were found for all variables of interest. The Success, Power and Competition subscale was positively related to many of the narcissism subscales, including: Authority, Entitlement, Exhibitionism, Exploitativeness, and Self Sufficiency. Restrictive Emotionality was negatively related to Authority and Superiority. Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men was negatively related to Exhibitionism and Superiority.

Table 5 displays correlations between masculine gender role conflict and psychological well-being variables. All variables of interest were significantly related. Conflicts Between Work and Family Relationships were positively related to Anxiety, Depression and Anger. Restrictive Emotionality was also positively related to Anxiety, Depression and Interpersonal Sensitivity.

Principal Analysis

The research questions posed in this study included assessing the relationship of masculine gender role conflict to attachment, narcissism and psychological well-being. The study made three hypotheses regarding this relationship. The study hypothesized that high masculine gender role

conflict would be related to attachment. Specifically, the study hypothesized that high masculine gender role conflict would be related to less closeness and ability to depend on others and a lack of anxiety in terms of attachment. The study further hypothesized that higher masculine gender role conflict would be associated with higher degrees of narcissism. The last hypothesis predicted that men who score higher on masculine gender role conflict would also score higher on measures of anxiety, depression and anger. To address these questions a canonical correlation procedure was employed to assess the relationships of these sets of variables. Each hypothesis was addressed by performing three separate canonical correlation procedures with masculine gender role conflict as one set of variables and attachment, narcissism, and psychological well-being making up the other set of variables. Level of significance was determined for each root if the overall canonical correlation was significant. Each score was then scrutinized to assess its relationship to the canonical root, and an interpretive cutoff score of .30 was used to assess reporting. In addition, the canonical correlation was squared to assess the amount of variance in one variate that was predicted from its paired variate.

The first canonical correlation procedure was performed with the attachment variables. The findings (Table 6)

indicated that one canonical root was significant. The first canonical root yielded a correlation of .70, $F(3,146)=9.92$, $p<.000$. The squared canonical correlation indicated that 48.4% of the variance in one variate could be explained by its paired variate. The standardized canonical coefficients indicated that Restrictive Emotionality was the most heavily weighted of the masculine gender role conflict variables and Close as the most heavily weighted attachment variable. Within this canonical variate two of the masculine gender role variables were correlated with the first canonical variate and all three of the attachment variables were related to the variate. The canonical variates suggest that those with lower masculine gender role conflict in the areas of Restrictive Emotionality ($r = -.96$) and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men ($r = -.30$) tended to report higher Close ($r = .97$) and Depend ($r = .60$) and lower Anxiety ($r = -.58$). These results are partially contrary to the hypotheses of the study. It was expected that higher gender role conflict would be related to low Anxiety. The current results suggest that low Anxiety is related to low gender role conflict. It does appear, however, that masculine gender role conflict is related in the expected direction to Close and Depend. Masculine gender role conflict is inversely related to Close and Depend, as expected.

The second canonical correlation procedure was performed with the narcissism variables. The findings (Table 7) indicated that three canonical roots were significant. The third root yielded only 9% of the variance, so this root was not interpreted. The first canonical root yielded a correlation of .64, $F(7,142)=5.18$, $p<.000$. The squared canonical correlation indicated that 40.5% of the variance in one variate could be explained by its paired variate. The standardized canonical coefficients indicated that Success, Power and Competition was the most heavily weighted of the masculine gender role conflict variables and Entitlement was the most heavily weighted narcissism variable. Within this canonical variate Success, Power and Competition were correlated with the first canonical variate and all seven of the narcissism variables were related to the variate. The canonical variates suggest that those with higher masculine gender role conflict in the area of Success, Power and Competition ($r = .95$) tended to report higher narcissism within all variables: Authority ($r = .63$), Entitlement ($r = .86$), Exhibitionism ($r = .57$), Exploitativeness ($r = .57$), Self Sufficiency ($r = .58$), Superiority ($r = .31$) and Vanity ($r = .33$). These results were as expected within the hypotheses of the study.

The second canonical root for the narcissism variables (Table 7) yielded a correlation of .46, $F(7,142)=3.3$,

$p < .000$. The squared canonical correlation indicated that 21.1% of the variance in one variate could be explained by its paired variate. The standardized canonical coefficients indicated that Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men were the most heavily weighted of the masculine gender role conflict variables and Superiority was the most heavily weighted narcissism variable. Within this canonical variate lower scores on Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men were correlated with higher scores on Authority, Exhibitionism, Superiority, and Vanity. The canonical variates suggest that those with lower masculine gender role conflict in the area of Restrictive Emotionality ($r = -.93$) and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men ($r = -.76$) tended to report higher narcissism within Authority ($r = .56$), Exhibitionism ($r = .50$), Superiority ($r = .73$) and Vanity ($r = .38$). These results were contrary to the hypotheses of the study.

The third canonical correlation procedure was with the psychological well-being variables. The findings (Table 8) indicated that one canonical root was significant. The first canonical root yielded a correlation of .50, $F(3,146) = 4.37$, $p < .000$. The squared canonical correlation indicated that 24.7% of the variance in one variate could be explained by its paired variate. The standardized canonical

coefficients indicated that Conflicts between Work and Family Relationships and Restrictive Emotionality were the most heavily weighted of the masculine gender role conflict variables and Depression and Anger were the most heavily weighted psychological well-being variables. Within this canonical variate Conflict Between Work and Family Relationships and Restrictive Emotionality were correlated with the all three of the psychological well-being variables. The canonical variates suggest that those with lower masculine gender role conflict in the areas of Conflict Between Work and Family Relationships ($\underline{r} = -.53$) and Restrictive Emotionality ($\underline{r} = -.71$) tended to report lower level of symptoms within all variables: Anxiety ($\underline{r} = -.66$), Depression ($\underline{r} = -.94$), and Anger ($\underline{r} = -.87$). These results were as expected within the hypotheses of the study.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The major purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of masculine gender role conflict to attachment, narcissism, and psychological well-being dimensions. The first hypothesis predicted that men who scored higher on masculine gender role conflict would lack feelings of closeness to others, feel as if they cannot depend on others and lack anxiety about relationships to others on an attachment measure. The results of the current study partially support this hypothesis. In the current study, individuals who reported low masculine gender role conflict tended to report comfort with being close to others and depending on them, while also reporting low anxiety about the availability of others. Therefore, the attachment dimensions related to feeling comfortable with closeness and depending on others was related in the expected direction, while anxiety about the availability of others was related in the opposite direction as hypothesized. The second hypothesis proposed by this study predicted that men who reported high masculine gender role conflict would have a greater degree of narcissism. This hypothesis was generally supported by the current study, although two relationships were found, one which supports the current hypothesis, and

one which suggests another grouping of results that run contrary to the current hypothesis. The first grouping of results indicated that individuals who reported higher masculine gender role conflict within the success, power and competition dimension also reported higher narcissism in all dimensions including: exploitativeness, entitlement, leadership, authority, superiority, self sufficiency, and vanity. Contrary to expectation, the second grouping of results indicated that individuals who reported low gender role conflict in terms of restrictive emotionality and restrictive affectionate behavior between men, also reported high narcissism within the authority, exhibitionism, superiority, and vanity dimensions.

The third and final hypothesis predicted that men who reported higher masculine gender role conflict would also report higher depression, anxiety, and anger. This hypothesis was generally supported by the current study. Individuals who reported higher gender role conflicts within the restrictive emotionality and conflict between work and family also reported higher symptoms of depression, anxiety, and anger.

Several issues emerged from the results which bear further examination and discussion. Attachment dimensions were related to masculine gender role conflict in a manner that suggested that healthy attachment was related to low

masculine gender role conflict; however, unhealthy attachment was not related in the manner that was expected. A second issue involves the narcissism dimensions being related in a manner that suggested a subset of individuals experiencing gender role conflict and narcissistic interpersonal attitudes. However, a second surprising relationship emerged that seems to relate to individuals who reported low gender role conflict and narcissism. A third issue involves the expected relationship between gender role conflict and psychological well-being dimensions.

Attachment Variables

Research and theory support the idea of attachment as an interpersonal attitudinal set that relates to gender roles. Attachment literature implicates the broad role of attachment in many facets of interpersonal life. Due to attachment's influence on interpersonal issues, attachment may relate to one's ability to gain social support and build meaningful relationships with others. Very little scholarship has addressed attachment's relationship to gender roles. This study extends previous research by addressing the relationship of attachment to masculine gender role conflict. It is suggested that interpersonal variables, such as attachment, may relate to men's ability to find and be satisfied with relationships, which may then

be related to men's adjustment. It was hypothesized that unhealthy attachment, specifically an "avoidant" style of attachment (indicated by low feelings of comfort with closeness, and depending on others combined with low anxiety about the availability of others) would be related to high masculine gender role conflict.

Results were mixed in relationship to the hypothesis that an avoidant style would be related to high masculine gender role conflict. Theory and research suggested that avoidant men were more likely to be traditionally masculine and experience high masculine gender role conflict. For example, in a seminal article on attachment and gender, the authors stated, "[a]voidant men's devaluing of relationships may simply reflect adherence to traditional stereotypes" (Kirkpatrick and Davis, 1994, p.511). Avoidant men, in the empirical literature, were found to be less committed, satisfied, intimate and less emotional (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994). Despite these empirical and conceptual links the current results suggest that a secure attachment style (high ability and comfort in being close, depending on others and low anxiety) is related to low masculine gender role conflict. In addition, an avoidant style was not related to high masculine gender role conflict. These findings support the idea that low masculine gender role conflict is related to healthy

(secure) attachment, however it does not support the idea that high masculine gender role conflict is related to unhealthy (avoidant) attachment.

These surprising results relate specifically, in terms of masculine gender role conflict, to restricting emotion and restricting affectionate behavior in relationships with other men. Thus, it appears that men who report being comfortable with emotional expression, in a variety of contexts, are more likely to report healthy, secure attachment within important relationships. Emotion appears to play a large part in men feeling comfortable with being close to others and depending on them as well as experiencing low levels of anxiety about the availability of others. This is important because it addresses the importance of emotion in men's ability to have intimate relationships and be satisfied within them. In addition, this finding links attachment, seen as an interpersonal style that is related to many interpersonal outcomes, and masculine gender role conflict.

This linkage, between attachment and masculine gender role conflict, is consistent with a recent article that also linked attachment to masculine gender role conflict (Fischer & Good, 1998). This study indicated that more secure relationships with mothers and fathers were related to less masculine gender role conflict. The attachment measures

used in this study, however, are not intended to measure attachment as an enduring interpersonal style, but more as degree of closeness and ability to depend, at the current time, and with parents only. Despite these differences with the current study, this article indicated that attachment to parents at the current time is related to masculine gender role conflict in expected directions.

In addition, the current study is consistent with past studies which have shown the importance of masculine gender role conflict to feelings of intimacy and closeness in interpersonal relationships. Studies which have addressed intimacy within relationships and masculine gender role conflict have found that an inability to identify and express emotion was related to a fear of intimacy and lack of mental health (Fischer & Good, 1997; Good et al., 1995). It is logical to assume that the attachment dimension in the current study indicates a comfort with closeness that is similar to intimacy demonstrated in past studies. Thus, the current study seems to replicate the idea that comfort with emotional expression seems to be closely and positively related to one's ability to be comfortable in relationships.

In summary, masculine gender role conflict was related to attachment dimensions. Individuals who reported low gender role conflict and were able to express emotion in a

variety of contexts, also reported having a healthy and secure attachment style. Contrary to expectations, unhealthy attachment styles, such as avoidant attachment, were not found to be related to high gender role conflict within this sample. The emotional lives of men, especially their identification and expression of emotion, seems to be a very important factor in their ability to feel comfortable in intimate relationships. This ability to be comfortable in relationships may relate to their ability to gain social support and their ability to have psychological well-being.

Narcissism Variables

Past theory and research on narcissism has indicated that narcissism can have negative effects on an individual's interpersonal functioning. Although there is reason to believe that narcissism is particularly salient for men, no research to date has addressed narcissism and its relationship to masculine gender role conflict. This study begins to address the relationship of masculine gender role conflict to narcissism and may begin to address narcissistic aspects of traditional masculine socialization. Although narcissism can be seen to have negative effects on interpersonal functioning, some aspects of narcissism may relate to healthy positive self regard (Raskin, Novacek & Hogan, 1991; Raskin & Novacek, 1989; Raskin & Terry, 1988). It is important, based on past research, to address the

possibility that some amount and degree of narcissism can help manage self esteem, although at higher levels narcissism can be unhealthy and relate to negative interpersonal outcomes. It was expected that higher levels of masculine gender role conflict would be related to higher degrees of narcissism.

Results of the current study were mixed and masculine gender role conflict had a varied relationship to narcissistic dimensions. The first grouping of relationships indicated that high gender role conflict, in terms of an overwhelming drive for success and power that requires competition and interferes with other aspects of their life, was related to higher levels of narcissism on all dimensions as expected. Surprisingly, a second grouping of relationships indicated that individuals who reported low amounts of restricting emotions and restricting affectionate behavior with other men also reported higher degrees of narcissism on authority, exhibitionism, superiority, and vanity dimensions.

The first grouping of relationships is important because it links narcissism with masculine gender role conflict, thus relating an important interpersonal style factor to masculine gender role conflict. It seems logical that a highly narcissistic style of relating to others is related to decreased ability to find and be comfortable in

close relationships. This finding is consistent with research that shows a narcissistic style of relating to be less likeable interpersonally (Caroll et al., 1991; Caroll et al., 1996). Thus, highly masculine men, and their associated narcissistic interpersonal style, may find interpersonal relationships don't provide the level of social support that helps buffer stress resulting in poorer adjustment.

The second grouping of relationships was contrary to expectation and is an interesting finding that deserves further examination. Men in this group reported an ability to express emotions in many contexts, and also reported more narcissistic responses related to authority, exhibitionism, superiority, and vanity. There is empirical and theoretical support for the notion that this subset of findings may be indicative of individuals who have an ability to express emotion and healthy narcissism that leads to a degree of positive self-regard (Raskin, Novacek & Hogan, 1991; Raskin & Novacek, 1989; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Empirical research on narcissism suggests that the narcissistic dimensions related to authority and vanity contribute to "nondefensive self-esteem" (Raskin et al., 1991). In addition, the narcissistic dimensions of exhibitionism and superiority have been related to positive or neutral characteristics in previous studies. For example, exhibitionism has been

related to extraversion and superiority has been related to self-confidence and social presence. Exploitativeness and entitlement, in contrast, were associated with negative characteristics such as hostility and dominance, and are not present in the current grouping (Raskin & Terry, 1988). In support of these previous studies the current study indicated that narcissistic responses related to authority were associated with fewer symptoms on a measure of psychological well-being.

These findings are also consistent with masculine gender role theory which suggests that traditional sex roles are contradictory and inconsistent (Pleck, 1981). For example, men are socialized to engage in and become proficient at intellectual and non-emotional activities. In contrast they are also often expected to be proficient at having emotional and intimate relationships with women. In addition, men who violate traditional sex roles (e.g., display emotion openly) are condemned socially. These sex roles may then become psychologically dysfunctional for men. Therefore, it seems logical that for men to overcome their early socialization, current social condemnation, current contradictory societal messages, and resulting psychological dysfunction it may be necessary to have a high degree of corresponding positive self regard.

Positive self regard may help men buffer societies

negative view of men displaying emotions within a variety of settings, including interpersonal relationships. This positive self-regard may enable men to be more capable of both identifying and expressing emotions. It seems logical that in order to break social mores and norms he must have a high degree of positive self regard. In having higher self regard he can go against social norms, which may then lead to healthy expression of emotion which may then relate to being comfortable with closeness and intimacy in relationships.

In summary, narcissism variables were related to masculine gender role conflict. In the first grouping of results men who reported high masculine gender role conflict in terms of drive for success also reported more narcissistic responses. In the second grouping of results, men who reported less masculine gender role conflict and more comfort expressing emotion in a variety of contexts also reported more narcissistic responses related to authority, exhibitionism, superiority, and vanity. The first grouping of results seems to represent narcissistic individuals who have masculine gender role conflicts which are expressed as a drive for success and power. The second subset of results seems to represent individuals who are able to express emotion and have positive self-regard and self-esteem. These two groupings may suggest two separate

ways of approaching masculine gender role issues with men. Some men may act in a traditionally socialized masculine manner and appear narcissistic to others, which may potentially affect their interpersonal lives and lead to lowered social support and adjustment. Other men may be less traditionally masculine and more capable of expressing emotion which may lead to, or result from, a positive self-regard and esteem.

Adjustment Variables

Research findings support the broad negative effect of masculine gender role conflict on psychological well-being and adjustment in men. This study differed from past studies in its attempt to assess potential mediating factors between gender role conflict and adjustment. It was expected that the results of the current study would replicate past research by indicating that masculine gender role conflict is associated with negative effects on adjustment, specifically within the areas of depression, anxiety and anger.

Results support the view that masculine gender role conflict is related to less psychological well-being. Individuals who reported lower masculine gender conflict within the areas of restricting emotionality and having conflicts between work and family relationships also reported lower levels of symptoms of depression, anxiety and

anger. This finding replicates previous research which indicates that masculine gender role conflict is related to poorer adjustment.

The current results are consistent with past literature on masculine gender role conflict and adjustment. Past research has consistently implicated restricting one's emotions and having conflicts between work and family relationships as being related to poorer adjustment. Restricting one's emotions has been related to paranoia, psychoticism, interpersonal sensitivity, depression and global psychological distress (Good et al., 1996, 1996; Good & Fischer, 1997; Good & Wood, 1995 and Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Having conflicts between work and family relationships has been related to obsessive-compulsivity, depression and global psychological distress (Good et. al., 1995; Good et al., 1996; Good & Wood, 1995 and Sharpe and Hepner, 1991). There seems to be solid evidence for the negative effects of masculine gender role conflict on a variety of adjustment variables.

In summary, masculine gender role conflict is related to psychological well-being in the current study which replicates previous research. Less restriction of emotions and fewer conflicts between work and family relationships were related to better adjustment. In other words, men who reported less masculine gender role conflict, in the

aforementioned areas, seem to be better adjusted in terms of symptoms of depression, anxiety and anger. Men who can express emotions and can be comfortable with the amount of success they have been able to find, without being driven in a unhealthy manner, would logically be better adjusted. These individuals may put less pressure on themselves, and be able to express their feelings about the state of their lives leading to better adjustment and potentially better relationships to others.

Limitations

Limitations of the current study include sampling issues, counter-balancing issues, time of measurement issues, and correlational design issues. The sample used for the current study includes men between the ages of 18-22. This sample may not apply to differently-aged men. In addition, the current research measures were not counter-balanced, due to the initial nature of the study, and future research should address this potential issue.

Other limitations of the current study include time of measurement issues. Survey data is limited to the time at which individuals are sampled. For example, attachment dimensions may fluctuate depending on the individuals current attachment figures and close relationships. Despite these limitations, the given sample is assumed to be a good representation of other individuals with similar

characteristics, with the aforementioned qualifications.

The final limitation of the current study is its correlational design. Causality cannot be attributed to the results and the results must be qualified accordingly.

Implications and Future Research

This study implies that masculine gender role conflict is related to attachment, narcissism and psychological well-being. Masculine gender role conflict seems to be related in an important manner to different interpersonal style variables that may relate to one's ability to gain social support and eventually to one's level of adjustment. By studying different interpersonal issues related to masculine gender role conflict it is possible to begin to address mediating factors that affect men's ability to be mentally healthy. This may eventually lead to targeted interventions for men who are very traditional and are experiencing masculine role conflict.

Current interventions for traditional men who are struggling with masculine gender role conflict can be seen to be fraught with difficulties, such as negative attitudes toward seeking help (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Good, Dell & Mintz, 1989). In addition, the current study implies that traditional men may also present with narcissistic attitudes and less healthy attachment within therapy. This study, by explicating some of the interpersonal factors related to

masculine gender roles, may help psychotherapists to predict some of the issues that may be present in a therapy situation. Due to these interpersonal factors it is possible that an interpersonal therapy approach may be beneficial for men experiencing masculine gender role conflict (Mahalik, 1999). It should also be noted that this study also implies that a subset of men may have a degree of narcissism that can be looked at as healthy and may be related to emotional expression in a variety of contexts. These men may actually respond better to a psychotherapy situation than more traditional men, due to their seeming comfort with emotional expression.

In addition to intervention implications, implications exist for further research. Future research should address the predictive aspects of masculine gender role conflict, in terms of interpersonal factors such as attachment and narcissism. This would enable the field to move toward an understanding of masculine gender role as being predictive of interpersonal issues that affect adjustment. It is also possible that other mediating factors exist which may or may not be interpersonal in nature. Other mediating factors should be explored in future research to help provide areas of intervention for men experiencing masculine gender role conflict. This may enable psychotherapists to begin to address why masculine gender role conflict is so detrimental

to men's functioning in an applied manner.

APPENDIX A
TABLES

Table 1

Demographic information

Variables	n	%
Age		
18	13	8.7
19	39	26.0
20	33	22.0
21	35	23.3
22	30	20.0
Ethnicity		
Caucasian	112	74.7
African American	18	12.0
Asian	10	6.7
Hispanic	8	5.3
Other	2	1.3
Relationship Status:		
currently married/living	10	6.7
with significant other		
never married/never lived	140	93.3
with significant other		
widowed/divorced	0	0.0
Religious Affiliation		
Agnostic	11	7.3
Atheistic	7	4.7
Catholics	29	19.3
Jewish	3	2.0
Protestant	37	24.7
Other	63	42.0

Table 2

Means, standard deviations, and range of scores for Masculine gender Role Conflict scale, Adult Attachment scale, Narcissistic Personality Inventory, and Hopkins Symptom Checklist scale

Scale	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Possible Range	Range
Masculine Gender Role Conflict Scale				
CWF	22.03	6.58	6-36	6-36
SPC	51.08	11.5	13-78	15-78
RE	30.39	9.61	10-60	10-55
RA	27.49	9.27	8-48	8-48
Adult Attachment Scale				
Close	22.05	5.21	6-30	6-30
Depend	19.18	4.77	6-30	6-30
Anxiety	16.05	5.71	6-30	7-22
Narcissistic Personality Inventory				
Authority	4.83	2.22	0-8	0-8
Entitlement	2.21	1.43	0-6	0-6
Exhibitionism	2.41	1.87	0-7	0-7
Exploitation	2.17	1.47	0-5	0-5
Self Sufficient	2.91	1.29	0-6	0-6
Superiority	2.71	1.49	0-5	0-5
Hopkins Symptom Checklist				
Depression	18.14	5.74	11-44	11-43
Anxiety	9.93	2.65	7-28	7-22
Anger	11.95	3.49	7-28	7-23

Note. CWF=Conflict Between Work and Family; SPC=Success, Power, and Competition; RE=Restrictive Emotionality; RA=Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men
N=150

Table 3

Correlations between Masculine Gender Role Conflict variables and Adult Attachment Scale variables

	CLOS	DEP	ANX	CWF	RE	RA	SPC
CLOS	1.0						
DEP	.48**	1.0					
ANX	-.37**	-.46**	1.0				
CWF	-.13	-.16*	.14	1.0			
RE	-.64**	-.41**	.36**	.33**	1.0		
RA	-.22**	-.21**	.01	.26**	.52**	1.0	
SPC	-.04	.01	.00	.34**	.26**	.33**	1.0

Note. RE=Restrictive Emotionality; RA=Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; SPC=Success, Power, and Competition; CLOS=Close; DEP=Depend; ANX=Anxiety
*p < .05 , **p < .01

Table 4

Correlations between Masculine Gender Role Conflict variables and Narcissistic Personality Inventory variables

	AUTH	ENTI	EXHI	EXPLO	SEIFS	SUP	VAN
AUTH	1.0						
ENTI	.41**	1.0					
EXHI	.53**	.43**	1.0				
EXPLO	.44**	.26**	.34**	1.0			
SEIFS	.40**	.28**	.34**	.29**	1.0		
SUP	.45**	.36**	.50**	.26**	.36**	1.0	
VAN	.22**	.28**	.40**	.05	.10	.16*	1.0
CWF	.01	.13	-.07	.03	-.10	-.02	-.10
RE	-.23**	.14	-.15	.00	.06	-.27**	-.11

(table continues)

Table 4 (continued)

	AUTH	ENTI	EXHI	EXPLO	SEIFS	SUP	VAN
RA	-.06	.01	-.19*	.13	.00	-.28**	-.16*
SPC	.35**	.53**	.28**	.36**	.32**	.13	.14

Note. RE=Restrictive Emotionality; RA=Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; SPC=Success, Power, and Competition; AUTH=Authority; ENTI=Entitlement; EXHI=Exhibitionism; EXPLO=Exploitativeness; SEIFS=Self Sufficiency; SUP=Superiority; VAN=Vanity

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 5

Correlations between Masculine Gender Role Conflict variables and Hopkins Symptom Checklist variables

	ANX	DEP	ANG
ANX	1.0		
DEP	.63**	1.0	
ANG	.52**	.66**	1.0
CWF	.16*	.21**	.27**
RE	.31**	.35**	.28**
RA	.01	-.04	-.07
SPC	.00	-.01	.05

Note. RE=Restrictive Emotionality; RA=Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; SPC=Success, Power, and Competition; ANX=Anxiety; DEP=Depression; ANG=Anger
 *p < .05 , **p < .01

Table 6

Correlations, standardized canonical coefficients, canonical correlations for masculine role conflict variables and attachment variables and their corresponding canonical variates

	<u>Canonical Variate</u>	
	Correlation	Coefficient
<hr/>		
MGRCS Variables		
CWF	-.23	.03
RA	-.30	.23
RE	-.96	-1.13
SPC	-.04	.17
Attachment Variables		
CLOS	.96	.84
DEP	.60	.08
ANX	-.58	-.23
Canonical correlation		.70**
Squared Canonical correlation		.48
<hr/>		

Note. MGRCS=Masculine Gender Role Conflict Scale;
 RE=Restrictive Emotionality; RA=Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; SPC=Success, Power, and Competition Attachment Variables=Adult Attachment Scale; CLOS=Close; DEP=Depend; ANX=Anxious

*p < .05 , ** p < .01

Table 7

Correlations, standardized canonical coefficients, canonical correlations for masculine role conflict variables and narcissism variables and their corresponding canonical variates

	<u>First Canonical Variate</u>		<u>Second Canonical Variate</u>	
	Correlation	Coefficient	Correlation	Coefficient
MGRCS Variables				
CWF	.09	-.23	-.26	.05
RA	.12	-.18	-.76	-.43
RE	.12	.00	-.93	-.77
SPC	.95	1.09	-.18	.15
Narcissism Variables				
AUTH	.63	.16	.56	.51
ENTI	.86	.67	-.05	.55
EXHI	.57	.08	.50	.16
EXPLO	.57	.27	-.00	-.31
SELS	.58	.30	.18	-.11

(table continues)

Table 7 (continued)

<u>First Canonical Variate</u>		<u>Second Canonical Variate</u>	
Correlation	Coefficient	Correlation	Coefficient
SUP	.31	.73	.70
VAN	.33	.38	.27
Canonical correlation			
Squared Canonical correlation	.64**	.46**	
	.41	.21	

Note. MGRC=Masculine Gender Role Conflict Scale; RE=Restrictive Emotionality; RA=Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; SPC=Success, Power, and Competition Narcissism Variables=Narcissistic Personality Inventory; AUTH=Authority; ENTI=Entitlement; EXHI=Exhibitionism; EXPLO=Exploitativeness; SELFS=Self Sufficiency; SUP=Superiority; VAN=Vanity
 * p < .05 , ** p < .01

Table 8

Correlations, standardized canonical coefficients, canonical correlations for masculine role conflict variables and psychological well being variables and their corresponding canonical variates

	<u>Canonical Variate</u>	
	Correlation	Coefficient
MGRCS Variables		
CWF	-.53	-.45
RA	.11	.68
RE	-.71	-.96
SPC	-.02	.16
Psychological Well-Being Variables		
DEP	-.94	-.04
ANX	-.66	-.62
ANG	-.88	-.44
Canonical correlation		.50**
Squared Canonical correlation		.25

Note. MGRC=Masculine Gender Role Conflict Scale; RE=Restrictive Emotionality; RA=Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; SPC=Success, Power, and Competition Psychological Well-Being Variables=Hopkins Symptom Checklist Scale; ANX=Anxiety; DEP=Depression; ANG=Anger

*p < .05 , **p < .01

APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT

INFORMED CONSENT

This study is exploring men's gender roles and interpersonal relationships. It is hoped that the results will increase our understanding of young adult development and relationships. Participation will involve completing questionnaires that will take approximately one hour of your time. If you choose to participate in this study your answers will be kept confidential. There will be no risks or discomforts involved in the study. You may withdraw from the study at any time if you choose to do so. Participation is voluntary, and if applicable, participants can receive 2 extra credit points in psychology classes. Completion of the research packet is necessary to earn extra credit.

The questionnaires each contain instructions which are self explanatory. It is very important that you answer every question. Please be completely honest. Your answers are entirely confidential and will be useful only if they accurately describe you.

To receive a summary of the results of this study send your request and a self-addressed stamped envelope to Brian Selby at the Psychology Department. You can also reach me at #565-2671 if you have any questions. This project will be approved by the Institutional Review Board Human Subjects Committee.

If you are willing to participate please sign below. This form will be separated from your questionnaires upon receipt.

Thank you for your participation.

Brian W. Selby, M.S.
Counseling Psychology Program
Psychology Department
University of North Texas

Name (print)

Signature

Date _____

APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRES

Demographic Data Sheet

INSTRUCTIONS: On the line to the left of each statement, place the number that corresponds to the answer that best describes you. Please respond to all items.

1. _____ Sex 2. _____ Age 3. _____ Race

- 1. male
- 2. female

- 1. White
- 2. Black
- 3. Hispanic
- 4. Asian
- 5. Other

4. _____ Education

- 1. First year
- 2. Sophomore
- 3. Junior
- 4. Senior

5. _____ Religious Affiliation

- 1. Agnostic
- 2. Atheistic
- 3. Catholic
- 4. Jewish
- 5. Protestant
- 6. Other

6. _____ How Important are your religious beleifs?

- 1. Very important
- 2. Important
- 3. Minimally important
- 4. Not important at all

7. _____ Marital Status

1. Never Married/Never Lived with Significant Other
2. Married/Living with Significant Other
3. Divorced
4. Widowed

8. _____ How many significant relationships have you had in the past?

1. One to three
2. Four to six
3. Seven to ten
4. More than ten

Please read each of the following statements and rate the extent to which it describes you and your feelings about close relationships. Think about all your close relationships, past and present, and respond in terms of how you generally feel in these relationships. If you have never been in a romantic relationship, answer in terms of how you think you would feel. Please use the scale below and indicate the degree to which each statement characterizes you by placing a number between 1 and 5 in the space provided to the right of each statement.

	1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Not at all	Very
characteristic of me	characteristic of me
_____ 1)	I find it relatively easy to get close to others.
_____ 2)	I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on others.
_____ 3)	In relationships, I often worry that my partner does not really love me.
_____ 4)	I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like.
_____ 5)	I am comfortable depending on others.
_____ 6)	I do not worry about someone getting close to me.
_____ 7)	I find that people are never there when you need them.
_____ 8)	I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others.
_____ 9)	In relationships, I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.
_____ 10)	When I show my feelings for others I'm always afraid they will not feel the same about me.
_____ 11)	I often wonder whether my partner really cares about me.
_____ 12)	I am comfortable developing close relationships with others.
_____ 13)	I am nervous when anyone gets too close.
_____ 14)	I know that people will be there when I need them.
_____ 15)	I want to get close to people but I worry about being hurt by them.

- _____ 16) I find it difficult to trust others completely.
- _____ 17) Often, partners want me to be closer than I feel comfortable being.
- _____ 18) I am not sure that I can always depend on others to be there when I need them.

Instructions: This questionnaire consists of a number of pairs of statements with which you may or may not identify. Consider this example: A "I like having authority over people", versus B "I don't mind following orders". Which of these two statements is closer to your own feelings about yourself? If you identify more with "liking to have authority over people" than with "not minding following orders", then you would choose A.

You may identify with both "A" and "B". In this case you should choose the statement which seems closer to your personal feelings about yourself. Or, if you do not identify with either statement, select the one which is least objectionable or remote. In other words, read each pair of statements and then choose the one that is closer to your own feelings. Indicate your answer by circling either "A" or "B" for each item below.

1. A. I am a fairly sensitive person.
 B. I am more sensitive than most other people.
2. A. I have a natural talent for influencing other people.
 B. I am not good at influencing people.
3. A. Modesty doesn't become me.
 B. I am essentially a modest person.
4. A. Superiority is something that you acquire with experience.
 B. Superiority is something that you are born with.
5. A. I would do almost anything on a dare.
 B. I tend to be a fairly cautious person.
6. A. I would be willing to describe myself as a strong personality.
 B. I would be reluctant to describe myself as a strong personality.

7. A. When people complement me I sometimes get embarrassed.
B. I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so.
8. A. The thought of ruling the world frightens the hell out of me.
B. If I ruled the world it would be a much better place.
9. A. People just naturally gravitate towards me.
B. Some people like me.
10. A. I can usually talk my way out of anything.
B. I try to accept the consequences of my behavior.
11. A. When I play a game I don't mind losing once in a while.
B. When I play a game I hate to lose.
12. A. I prefer to blend in with the crowd.
B. I like to be the center of attention.
13. A. I will be a success.
B. I'm not too concerned about success.
14. A. I am no better nor no worse than most people.
B. I think I am a special person.
15. A. I am not sure if I would make a good leader.
B. I see myself as a good leader.
16. A. I am assertive.
B. I wish I were more assertive.
17. A. I like having authority over other people.
B. I don't mind following orders.
18. A. There is a lot that I can learn from other people.
B. People can learn a great deal from me.
19. A. I find it easy to manipulate people.
B. I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people.
20. A. I insist on getting the respect that is due me.
B. I usually get the respect that I deserve.
21. A. I don't particularly like to show off my body.
B. I like to display my body.

22. A. I can read people like a book.
B. People are sometimes hard to understand.
23. A. If I feel competent I am willing to take responsibility for making decisions.
B. I like to take the responsibility for making decisions.
24. A. I am at my best when the situation is at its worst.
B. Sometimes I don't handle difficult situations too well.
25. A. I just want to be reasonably happy.
B. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.
26. A. My body is nothing special.
B. I like to look at my body.
27. A. Beauty is in the eyes of the beholders.
B. I have good taste when it comes to beauty.
28. A. I try not to be a show off.
B. I am apt to show off if I get the chance.
29. A. I always know what I am doing.
B. Sometimes I'm not sure of what I am doing.
30. A. I sometimes depend on people to get things done.
B. I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done.
31. A. I'm always in perfect health.
B. Sometimes I get sick.
32. A. Sometimes I tell good stories.
B. Everybody likes to hear my stories.
33. A. I usually dominate my conversations.
B. At times I am capable of dominating a conversation.
34. A. I expect a great deal from other people.
B. I like to do things for other people.
35. A. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.
B. I take my satisfactions as they come.
36. A. Complements embarrass me.
B. I like to be complemented.

37. A. My basic responsibility is to be aware of the needs of others.
B. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
38. A. I have a strong will to power.
B. Power for its own sake doesn't interest me.
39. A. I don't very much care about new fads and fashions.
B. I like to start new fads and fashions.
40. A. I am envious of other people good fortune.
B. I enjoy seeing other people have good fortune.
41. A. I am loved because I am loveable.
B. I am loved because I give love.
42. A. I like to look at myself in the mirror.
B. I am not particularly interested in looking at myself in a mirror.
43. A. I am not especially witty or clever.
B. I am witty and clever.
44. A. I really like to be the center of attention.
B. It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention.

45. A. I can live my life in any way I want to.
B. People can't always live their lives in terms of what they want.
46. A. Being an authority doesn't mean that much to me.
B. People always seem to recognize my authority.
47. A. I would prefer to be a leader.
B. It would make little difference to me whether I am a leader or not.
48. A. I am going to be a great person.
B. I hope I am going to be successful.
49. A. People sometimes believe what I tell them.
B. I can make anyone believe anything I want them to.
50. A. I am a born leader.
B. Leadership is a quality that takes a long time to develop.
51. A. I wish someone would someday write my biography.
B. I don't like people to pry into my life for any reason.
52. A. I get upset when people don't notice how I look when I go out in public.
B. I don't mind blending into the crowd when I go out in public.
53. A. I am more capable than other people.
B. There is a lot that I can learn from other people.
54. A. I am much like everybody else.
B. I am an extraordinary person.

Please respond to the items below using the following scale:

- 1=strongly disagree
- 2=disagree
- 3=moderately disagree
- 4=moderately agree
- 5=agree
- 6=strongly agree

- 1._____ Moving up the career ladder is important to me.
- 2._____ I have difficulty telling others I care for them.
- 3._____ Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.
- 4._____ I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health.
- 5._____ Making money is a part of my idea of being a successful man.
- 6._____ Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.
- 7._____ Affection with other men makes me tense.
- 8._____ I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.
- 9._____ Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.
- 10._____ Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.
- 11._____ My career, job, or school affairs affects the quality of my leisure or family life.

- 12.____ I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.
- 13.____ Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.
- 14.____ I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.
- 15.____ I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.
- 16.____ Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.
- 17.____ Finding time to relax is difficult for me.
- 18.____ Doing well all the time is important to me.
- 19.____ I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.
- 20.____ Hugging other men is difficult for me.
- 21.____ I often feel I need to be in charge of those around me.
- 22.____ Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.
- 23.____ Competing with others is the best way to succeed.
- 24.____ Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.
- 25.____ I often have trouble finding words that describe how I feel.
- 26.____ I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.
- 27.____ My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more that I would like.
- 28.____ I strive to be more successful than others.
- 29.____ I do not like to show my emotions to other people.
- 30.____ Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.

- 31.____ My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, health, leisure).
- 32.____ I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.
- 33.____ Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.
- 34.____ Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.
- 35.____ Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).
- 36.____ Overwork, and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.
- 37.____ I like to feel superior to other people.

Below is a list of problems and complaints that people sometimes have. Please read each one carefully. After you have done so, please rate how much that problem has bothered or distressed you DURING THE PAST TWO WEEKS INCLUDING TODAY. To make your rating, use the scale shown in the example. Place that number in the open space to the left of the problem. Do not skip any items, and print your answer number clearly.

Example: How much were you distressed by:

___ 3 ___ Backaches

Ratings: 1. not at all
 2. a little bit
 3. quite a bit
 4. extremely

If you feel that "backaches" have been bothering you quite a bit during that past 2 weeks, you would record your response "3" as shown.

DURING THE PAST 2 WEEKS, INCLUDING TODAY, HOW MUCH WERE YOU BOTHERED BY:

1. _____ headaches
2. _____ nervousness or shakiness inside
3. _____ being unable to get rid of bad thoughts or ideas
4. _____ faintness or dizziness
5. _____ Loss of sexual interest or pleasure
6. _____ Feeling critical of others
7. _____ Bad dreams
8. _____ Difficulty in speaking when you are excited
9. _____ Trouble remembering things
10. _____ Worried about sloppiness or carelessness
11. _____ Feeling easily annoyed or irritated
12. _____ Pains in the heart or chest
13. _____ Itching
14. _____ Feeling low in energy or slowed down
15. _____ Thoughts of ending your life
16. _____ Sweating

- 17.____ Trembling
- 18.____ Feeling confused
- 19.____ Poor appetite
- 20.____ Crying easily
- 21.____ Feeling shy or uneasy with the opposite sex
- 22.____ A feeling of being trapped or caught
- 23.____ Suddenly scared for no reason
- 24.____ Temper outbursts you could not control
- 25.____ Constipation
- 26.____ Blaming yourself for things
- 27.____ Pains in the lower part of your back
- 28.____ Feeling blocked or stymied in getting things
done
- 29.____ Feeling lonely
- 30.____ Feeling blue
- 31.____ Worrying or stewing about things
- 32.____ Feeling no interest in things
- 33.____ Feeling fearful
- 34.____ Your feelings being easily hurt
- 35.____ Having to ask others what you should do
- 36.____ Feeling others do not understand you or are
unsympathetic
- 37.____ Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike
you

- 38.____ Having to do things very slowly in order to
be sure you are doing them right
- 39.____ Heart pounding or racing
- 40.____ Nausea or upset stomach
- 41.____ Feeling inferior to others
- 42.____ Soreness of your muscles
- 43.____ Loose bowel movements
- 44.____ Difficulty in falling asleep or staying
asleep
- 45.____ Having to check and double check what you do
- 46.____ Difficulty making decisions
- 47.____ Wanting to be alone
- 48.____ Trouble getting your breath
- 49.____ Hot or cold spells
- 50.____ Having to avoid certain places or activities
because they frighten you
- 51.____ Your mind going blank
- 52.____ Numbness or tingling in parts of your body
- 53.____ A lump in your throat
- 54.____ Feeling hopeless about the future
- 55.____ Trouble concentrating
- 56.____ Weakness in parts of your body
- 57.____ Feeling tense or keyed up
- 58.____ Heavy feelings in your arms and legs

REFERENCES

Akhtar, S., & Thomson, J.A. (1982). Overview: narcissistic personality disorder. American Journal of Psychiatry, 139, 12-20.

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th edition). Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association.

Antonucci, T.C. & Akiyama, H. (1987). An examination of sex differences in social support among older men and women. Sex Roles, 17, 737-749.

Barrera, M. (1986). Distinction between social support concepts: Measures and models. American Journal of Community Psychology, 14, 413-445.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 226-244.

Blazina, C. & Watkins, C.E. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes toward help-seeking. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43(4), 461-465.

Bly, R. (1990). Iron john: A book about men. Reading, MA: Random House.

Bowlby, J. (1988). Developmental psychiatry comes of age. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 145, 1-9.

Burda, P.C. & Vaux, A.C. (1987). The social support process in men: Overcoming sex role obstacles. Human Relations, 40, 31-44.

Carroll, L. (1989). A comparative study of narcissism, gender, and sex role orientation among bodybuilders, athletes, and psychology students. Psychological Reports, 64, 999-1006.

Carroll, L., Corning, A.F., Morgan, R.R. & Stevens, D.M. (1991). Perceived acceptance, psychological functioning, and sex role orientation of narcissistic persons. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6, 943-954.

Carroll, L., Hoenigmann-Stovall, N., Whitehead, G.I. (1996). Interpersonal consequences of narcissism. Psychological Reports, 79, 1267-1272.

Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. Psychosomatic Medicine, 38, 300-314.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models and relationship quality in dating couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 644-663.

Cook, E.P. (1990). Gender and psychological distress. Journal of Counseling and Development, 68, 371-375.

Cournoyer, R.J., & Mahalik, J.R. (1995). Cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle-aged men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42, 11-19.

Eisler, R.M., Skidmore, J.R. & Ward, C.H. (1988). Masculine gender role stress: Predictors of anger, anxiety, and health risk behaviors., Journal of Personality Assessment, 52, 133-141.

Emmons, R.A. (1987). Narcissism: theory and measurement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 11-17.

Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 281-291.

Fischer, A.R. & Good, G.E. (1997). Men and psychotherapy: An investigation of alexithymia, intimacy, and masculine gender roles. Psychotherapy, 34 (2), 160-170.

Fischer, A.R. & Good, G.E. (1998). Perceptions of parent-child relationships and masculine role conflicts of college men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45 (3), 346-352.

Freud, S. (1989). On narcissism: An introduction. In P.Gay, The Freud Reader. New York, NY: Norton.

Good, G.E., Dell, D.M. & Mintz, L.B. (1989). Male role and gender role conflict: Relations to help seeking in men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36, 295-300.

Good, G.E. & Mintz, L.B. (1990). Gender role conflict and depression in college men: Evidence for compounded risk. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 17-21.

Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M.A., & Bartels, K.M. (1996). The relation between masculine role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. Journal of Counseling and Development, 75, 44-49.

Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., O'Neil, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M., Debord, K.A., Bartels, K.M. & Braverman, D.G. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric issues and relations to psychological distress. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42, 3-10.

Good, G.E., Wallace, D.L., & Borst, T.S. (1994). Masculinity research: A review and critique. Applied and Preventative Psychology, 3, 3-14.

Good, G.E. & Wood, P.K. (1995). Male gender role conflict, depression, and help seeking: Do college men face double jeopardy? Journal of Counseling and Development, 74, 70-75.

Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 52, 511-524.

Heppner, P.P. (1995). On gender role conflict in men-future directions and implications for counseling: Comment on Good et al. (1995) and Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995). Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42(1), 20-23.

Kirkpatrick, L.A. & Davis, K.E. (1994). Attachment style, gender, relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66(3) 502-512.

Kernberg, O.F. (1975). Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism. New York: Jason Aronson.

Kohut, H. (1971). The analysis of the self. New York: International Universities Press.

Lewis, R.A. (1978). Emotional intimacy among men. Journal of Social Issues, 34, 108-121.

Mahalik, J.R. (1999). Interpersonal psychotherapy with men who experience gender role conflict. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 30(1), 5-13.

Mahler, M.S., & Kaplan, L. (1977). Developmental aspects in the assessment of narcissistic and so-called borderline. In P. Hartocollis (Ed.) Borderline personality disorders (pp. 71-86). New York: International Universities Press.

Masterson, J.F. (1988). The search for the real self. New York, NY: Free Press.

Masterson, J.F. (1990). Psychotherapy of borderline and narcissistic disorders: Establishing a therapeutic alliance. Journal of Personality Disorders, 4(2), 182-191.

Miller, A.M. The drama of the gifted child. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Miller, R.S., & Lefcourt, H.M. (1983). Social intimacy: An important moderator of stressful life events. American Journal of Community Psychology, 11, 127-139.

O'Neil, J.M. (1981a) Male sex-role conflicts, sexism, and masculinity: Psychological implications for men, women, and the counseling psychologist. The Counseling Psychologist, 9, 61-80.

O'Neil, J.M. (1981b). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 203-210.

O'Neil, J.M. (1982). Gender role conflict and strain in men's lives: Implications for psychiatrists, psychologists, and other human service providers. In K. Solomon & N.B. Levy (Eds.), Men in Transition (pp. 5-40). New York: Plenum Press.

O'Neil, J.M., Helms, B., Gable, R., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. Sex Roles, 14, 335-350.

Pleck, J. (1981). The myth of masculinity. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Raskin, R.N. & Hall, C.S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. Psychological Reports, 45, 590.

Raskin, R. & Novacek, J. (1989). An MMPI description of the narcissistic personality. Journal of Personality Assessment, 53(1), 66-80.

Raskin, R. Novacek, J. & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissism self-esteem management. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 911-918.

Raskin, R., Novacek, J, & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissism, self-esteem, and defensive self-enhancement. Journal of Personality, 59:1, 20-37.

Raskin R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 890-902.

Robertson, J.M., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1990). The (mis)treatment of men: Effects of client gender role and life style on diagnosis and attribution of pathology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39, 240-246.

Simonsen, G.O., Blazina, C. & Watkins, C.E. (in press). Gender role conflict and psychological well-being among gay men. Journal of Counseling Psychology.

Simpson, J.A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59(5), 911-980.

Sharpe, M.J. & Heppner, P.P. (1991). Gender role, gender role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38, 323-330.

Stillson, R.W., O'Neil, J.M., & Owen S.V. (1991). Predictors of adult men's gender-role conflict: Race, class, unemployment, age instrumentality-expressiveness, and personal strain. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38, 458-464.

Trobst, K.K., Collins, R.L., Embree, J.M. (1994). The role of emotion in social support provision: Gender, empathy and expressions of distress. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11, 45-62.

Turner, H.A. (1994). Gender and social support: Taking the bad with the good? Sex Roles, 30, 521-538.

Watson, P.J., Grisham, S.O., Trotter, M.V. & Biderman, M.D. (1984). Narcissism and empathy: Validity evidence for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. Journal of Personality Assessment, 48, 301-305.

Watson, P.J., Taylor, D. & Morris, R.J. (1987). Narcissism, sex roles and self-functioning. Sex Roles, 16, 335-356.